

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN
MILWAUKEE DIVISION

JACQUELINE HALL,
on behalf of herself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AUTUMN LAKE HEALTHCARE LLC
4201 Route 9
Howell, New Jersey 07731

and

CAMEO NURSING HOME, LLC
4201 Route 9
Howell, New Jersey 07731

Defendants

Case No. 21-cv-1108

**COLLECTIVE AND CLASS
ACTION COMPLAINT
PURSUANT TO 29 U.S.C. §216(b)
AND FED. R. CIV. P. 23**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This is a collective and class action brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, (“FLSA”), and Wisconsin’s Wage Payment and Collection Laws, Wis. Stat. § 109.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 104.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 103.001 *et seq.*, Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 274.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.001 *et seq.* (“WWPCL”) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, by Plaintiff, Jacqueline Hall, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants, Autumn Lake Healthcare LLC and Cameo Nursing Home, LLC, for purposes of obtaining relief under the FLSA and WWPCL for unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid regular and agreed upon wages, liquidated

damages, costs, attorneys' fees, declaratory and/or injunctive relief, and/or any such other relief the Court may deem appropriate.

2. Defendants operated (and continue to operate) an unlawful compensation system that deprived and failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for all hours worked and work performed each workweek at the proper, correct, and lawful overtime rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek by failing to include all forms of non-discretionary compensation, such as monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments, in said employees' regular rates of pay for overtime calculation purposes, in violation of the FLSA and WWPCL.

3. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home, LLC also operated (and continues to operate) an unlawful compensation system that deprived and failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for all hours worked and work performed each workweek – at a regular rate of pay and/or at an overtime rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek – by failing to compensate said employees for meal periods during which they were not completely relieved of duty or free from work for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration, in violation of the WWPCL, which resulted in overtime violations of the FLSA.

4. Defendants' failure to compensate its hourly paid, non-exempt employees for compensable work performed each workweek, including but not limited to at an overtime rate of pay, was intentional, willful, and violated federal law as set forth in the FLSA and state law as set forth in the WWPCL.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has original federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case is brought under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, *et seq.*

6. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, over the state law claims, Wisconsin's Wage Payment and Collection Laws, Wis. Stat. § 109.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 104.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 103.001 *et seq.*, Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 274.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.001 *et seq.*, because they are so related in this action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

7. Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), because Defendants have substantial and systematic contacts, including physical locations, in this District.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff, Jacqueline Hall, is an adult female resident of the State of Wisconsin residing at 2123 West Vilet Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53205.

9. Defendant, Autumn Lake Healthcare LLC, was, at all material times herein, a New Jersey entity doing business in the State of Wisconsin with a principal address of 4201 Route 9, Howell, New Jersey 07731.

10. Defendant Autumn Lake Healthcare LLC owns, operates, and manages skilled nursing facilities and assisted living facilities throughout the United States, including but not limited to in the State of Wisconsin.

11. Defendant, Cameo Nursing Home, LLC (hereinafter, at times, simply “Cameo Nursing Home”), was, at all material times herein, a New Jersey entity doing business in the State of Wisconsin with a principal address of 4201 Route 9, Howell, New Jersey 07731.

12. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home, LLC, which is commonly known as “The Suites at Greenfield” and/or “Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield,” is a skilled nursing facility located at 5790 South 27th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53221.

13. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant Autumn Lake Healthcare LLC e owned, operated, and managed Defendant Cameo Nursing Home, LLC and the “The Suites at Greenfield” and/or “Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield” location, located at 5790 South 27th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53221.

14. For purposes of the FLSA, Defendants were “employers” of an “employee,” Plaintiff, as those terms are used in 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(d) and (e).

15. For purposes of the WWPCL, Defendants were “employers” of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff was “employed” by Defendants, as those terms, or variations thereof, are used in Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01 *et seq.*, 103.01 *et seq.*, 104.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01.

16. During the relevant time periods as stated herein, Defendants were engaged in “commerce” and/or its employees were engaged in “commerce,” including Plaintiff, as that term is defined under the FLSA.

17. During the relevant time periods as stated herein, Defendants, both individually and collectively, employed more than two (2) employees.

18. During the relevant time periods as stated herein, Defendants’ annual dollar volume of sales or business, both individually and collectively, exceeded \$500,000.

19. During the relevant time periods as stated herein, Plaintiff was engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

20. Plaintiff's Notices of Consent to Join this collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) was contemporaneously filed with the Complaint (ECF No. 1).

21. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff worked as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees in the positions of Team Lead and Manager at Defendants' "The Suites at Greenfield" and/or "Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield" location, located at 5790 South 27th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53221.

22. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly-situated current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees employed by Defendants within the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff and all other current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees on whose behalf she brings this Complaint performed compensable work in the same or similarly-titled positions subject to Defendants' same unlawful compensation policies and practices as enumerated herein at Defendants' direction, on Defendants' behalf, for Defendants' benefit, and/or with Defendants' knowledge at locations that were owned, operated, and managed by Defendants.

23. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants hired, terminated, promoted, demoted, and/or suspended Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees.

24. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants supervised Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' day-to-day activities.

25. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants reviewed Plaintiff's work performance and the work performance of all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees.

26. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants established Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' work schedules and provided Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees with work assignments and hours of work.

27. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees similarly utilized Defendants' employment policies, practices, and/or procedures in the performance of their job duties.

28. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants oversaw, managed, and adjudicated Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' employment-related questions, benefits-related questions, and workplace issues.

29. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants established the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' employment.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

30. In approximately November 2006, Defendants hired Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee in the position of Team Lead at Defendants' "The Suites at Greenfield" and/or "Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield" location, located at 5790 South 27th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53221.

31. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Plaintiff worked as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee in the positions of Team Lead and Manager at Defendants' "The Suites at Greenfield" and/or "Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield" location, located at 5790 South 27th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53221.

32. In approximately September 2021, Plaintiff's employment with Defendants ended.

33. During the entirety of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants compensated Plaintiff on an hourly basis and/or with an hourly rate of pay.

34. During the entirety of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee for purposes of the FLSA and WWPCL.

35. On a daily basis during Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff worked alongside other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees as part of Defendants' skilled nursing services at Defendants' "The Suites at Greenfield" and/or "Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield" location.

36. On a daily basis during Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff performed compensable work at Defendants' direction, on Defendants' behalf, for Defendants' benefit, and/or with Defendants' knowledge as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee at Defendants' "The Suites at Greenfield" and/or "Autumn Lake Healthcare at Greenfield" location.

37. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees were employed by Defendants in hourly-paid, non-exempt job positions and performed compensable work on

Defendants' behalf, with Defendants' knowledge, for Defendants' benefit, and/or at Defendants' direction at physical locations that were owned, operated, and/or managed by Defendants.

38. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees regularly worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

39. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants knew or had knowledge that Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

40. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants compensated Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees on a bi-weekly basis via check.

41. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants' workweek for FLSA and WWPCL purposes was Sunday through Saturday.

42. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees were non-union employees of Defendants.

43. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees were subject to Defendants' same unlawful policy, practice, custom, and/or scheme of failing to include all forms of non-discretionary compensation, such as monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments, in their regular rates of pay for overtime purposes in violation of the FLSA and WWPCL.

44. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants compensated Plaintiff and all current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees with, in addition to an hourly or regular rate(s) of pay, such as performance-based and/or attendance-based monetary bonuses and incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments, on a bi-weekly, monthly quarterly, annual, and/or ad hoc basis.

45. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), the monetary compensation – such as performance-based and/or attendance-based monetary bonuses and incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments – that Defendants provided to Plaintiff and all current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees was made pursuant to a known plan (performance or productivity) or formula and/or was announced and known to said employees to encourage and/or reward their steady, rapid, productive, reliable, safe, consistent, regular, predictable, continued, and/or efficient work performance and/or hours worked.

46. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants' pay policies and practices failed to include all forms of non-discretionary compensation – such as the monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments noted in the aforementioned paragraphs – in Plaintiff's and all current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' regular rate(s) of pay for overtime calculation and compensation purposes during workweeks when said employees worked more than forty (40) hours during the representative time period that the monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments covered.

47. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees were

subject to Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's same unlawful policy, practice, custom, and/or scheme of failing to compensate said employees for meal periods during which they were not completely relieved of duty or free from work for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration, in violation of the WWPCCL, which resulted in overtime violations of the FLSA.

48. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees were subject to Defendants' same pay and timekeeping policies and practices.

49. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants tracked and/or recorded Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' hours worked each workweek.

50. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants maintained an electronic time-clock system (hereinafter simply "Defendants' electronic timekeeping system") that Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees used on a daily basis for timekeeping and/or recordkeeping purposes.

51. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees used Defendants' electronic timekeeping system on a daily basis for timekeeping and/or recordkeeping purposes.

52. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants maintained employment records and other documentation regarding Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees.

53. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants maintained a centralized system for tracking and/or recording hours worked by Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees.

54. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants maintained a centralized system for compensating Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for all remuneration earned, including but not limited to with monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments.

55. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees used Defendants' electronic timekeeping system to "clock in" and to "clock out" of work each day at the beginning and end of their shifts, respectively.

56. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees performed compensable work immediately after "clocking in" and immediately before "clocking out" via Defendants' electronic timekeeping system at the beginning and end of their shifts, respectively, each work day.

57. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's compensation policy in practice applicable to Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees was to automatically deduct a thirty (30) minute meal period each work day from said employees' timesheets.

58. On a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's policy in practice was not to

compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for a thirty (30) minute meal period.

59. Often times on a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' meal periods at Defendant Cameo Nursing Home actually lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration.

60. Often times on a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' meal periods actually lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration because said employees' were performing compensable work on Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's behalf, with Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's knowledge, for Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's benefit, and/or at Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's direction.

61. Often times on a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) and when Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees did not take a work-free meal period that actually lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration, Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees provided Annette Bohman, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's Administrator, with written "Memo" forms stating as much.

62. Often times on a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant Cameo Nursing Home knew or should have known that Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' meal periods actually lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration because said employees' were performing compensable work on Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's behalf,

with Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's knowledge, for Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's benefit, and/or at Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's direction.

63. On a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees' meal periods at Defendant Cameo Nursing Home were not work-free for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration.

64. On a daily basis during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees did not take and/or were not provided meal periods by Defendant Cameo Nursing Home that lasted at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration.

65. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant Cameo Nursing Home failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for on duty meal periods that lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration despite having actual or constructive knowledge that said employees' meal periods that lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration because said employees' were performing compensable work on Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's behalf, with Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's knowledge, for Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's benefit, and/or at Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's direction.

66. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants did not properly and lawfully compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for all hours actually worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek, including but not limited to at the proper, correct, and lawful overtime rate of pay.

67. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) and during workweeks when no overtime was due, if any, Defendants suffered or permitted Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees to work without being paid appropriate and lawful compensation for all hours worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek, at a regular rate of pay and/or at an overtime rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a workweek.

68. Defendants were or should have been aware that their compensation policies in practice failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees in the same or similar fashion for all hours worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek, including but not limited to at an overtime rate of pay.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS UNDER THE FLSA

69. Plaintiff bring this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated employees as authorized under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). The similarly situated employees include:

All hourly-paid, non-exempt employees employed by Defendants within the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) who have not been compensated for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek.

70. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective primarily performed non-exempt job duties each workweek and, thus, were legally entitled to overtime pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a workweek.

71. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective were compensated on an hourly basis (and not on a salary basis) each workweek and, thus, were legally entitled to overtime pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a workweek.

72. During the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendants' pay policies and practices failed to include all forms of non-discretionary compensation – such as monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments – in Plaintiff's and the FLSA Collective's regular rate(s) of pay for overtime calculation and compensation purposes during workweeks when said employees worked more than forty (40) hours during the representative time period that the monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments covered.

73. Also, during the three (3) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant Cameo Nursing Home, as a matter of policy and practice, failed to compensate the FLSA Collective for meal periods during which they were not completely relieved of duty or free from work for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration under the WWPC. These practices resulted in Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective being denied overtime compensation by Defendant Cameo Nursing Home at the rate of one and one-half times their regular hourly rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a workweek.

74. The First and Second Claims for Relief are brought under and maintained as opt-in Collective Actions pursuant to § 216(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. 216(b), by Plaintiff on behalf of the FLSA Collective.

75. The FLSA Collective claims may be pursued by those who affirmatively opt in to this case, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

76. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are and have been similarly situated, have and have had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and are and have been subject to Defendants' decisions, policies, plans and programs, practices, procedures, protocols,

routines, and rules willfully failing and refusing to compensate them for each hour worked including overtime compensation. The claims of Plaintiff as stated herein are the same as those of the FLSA Collective.

77. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective seek relief on a collective basis challenging, among other FLSA violations, Defendants' practice of failing to properly and lawfully compensate employees for all work performed and/or hours worked at the correct and lawful overtime rate of pay each workweek, in violation of the FLSA.

78. Defendants were or should have been aware that their unlawful practices failed to compensate and deprived Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective of the appropriate and lawful overtime wages and compensation due and owing to them, in violation of the FLSA.

79. The FLSA Collective is readily ascertainable. For purpose of notice and other purposes related to this action, the names, phone numbers, and addresses are readily available from Defendants. Notice can be provided to the FLSA Collective via first class mail to the last address known by Defendants and through posting at Defendants' physical locations in areas where postings are normally made.

80. Defendants' conduct, as set forth in this Complaint, was willful and in bad faith, and has caused significant damages to Plaintiff and the putative FLSA Collectives.

RULE 23 CLASS ALLEGATIONS – WISCONSIN

81. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly-situated employees pursuant to the WWPC, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23. The similarly situated employees include:

WWPCL Class (Non-Discretionary Compensation): All hourly-paid, non-exempt employees employed by Defendants within the two (2) years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) through the date of judgment who have not been compensated for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at the proper, correct, and/or lawful overtime rate of pay.

WWPCL Class (Meal Periods): All hourly-paid, non-exempt employees employed by Defendant Cameo Nursing Home within two (2) years immediately prior to the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) through the date of final judgment who have not been compensated for all hours worked each workweek – at either a regular rate of pay or at an overtime rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek – as a result of its failure to compensate said employees for daily on duty meal periods that lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration.

82. The members of the Wisconsin Classes are readily ascertainable. The number and identity of the members of the Wisconsin Classes are determinable from the records of Defendants. The job titles, length of employment, and the rates of pay for each member of the Wisconsin Classes are also determinable from Defendants' records. For purposes of notice and other purposes related to this action, their names and addresses are readily available from Defendants. Notice can be provided by means permissible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

83. The proposed Wisconsin Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, and more importantly the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court. Although the precise number of such persons is unknown, upon information and belief, there are over fifty (50) members of each of the Wisconsin Classes.

84. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those claims which could be alleged by any members of the Wisconsin Classes, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be sought by each member of the Wisconsin Classes in separate actions. All of the members of the Wisconsin Classes were subject to the same corporate practices of Defendants, as alleged herein.

Defendants' corporate-wide policies and practices affected all members of the Wisconsin Classes similarly, and Defendants benefited from the same type of unfair and/or wrongful acts as to each member of the Wisconsin Classes. Plaintiff and other members of the Wisconsin Classes sustained similar losses, injuries and damages arising from the same unlawful policies and practices and procedures.

85. Plaintiff is able to fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Wisconsin Classes and have no interests antagonistic to the Wisconsin Classes. Plaintiff is represented by counsel who are experienced and competent in both collective/class action litigation and employment litigation and have previously represented plaintiffs in wage and hour cases.

86. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy – particularly in the context of wage and hour litigation where individual class members lack the financial resources to vigorously prosecute a lawsuit against corporate defendants. Class action treatment will permit a number of similarly-situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of efforts and expense that numerous individual actions engender. Because the losses, injuries and damages suffered by each of the individual Wisconsin Class members are small in the sense pertinent to a class action analysis, the expenses and burden of individual litigation would make it extremely difficult or impossible for the individual members of the Wisconsin Classes to redress the wrongs done to them.

87. Important public interests will be served by addressing the matter as a class action. The adjudication of individual litigation claims would result in a great expenditure of Court and public resources; however, treating the claims as a class action would result in a significant saving of these costs. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of

the Wisconsin Classes would create a risk of inconsistent and/or varying adjudications with respect to the individual members of the Wisconsin Classes, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants and resulting in the impairment of class members' rights and the disposition of their interests through actions to which they were not parties. The issues in this action can be decided by means of common, class-wide proof. In addition, if appropriate, the Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to efficiently manage this action as a class action.

88. Defendants have violated the WWPCCL regarding payment of wages. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing claims because doing so can harm their employment, future employment, and future efforts to secure employment. Class actions provide class members who are not named in the Complaint a degree of anonymity which allows for the vindication of their rights while eliminating or reducing these risks.

89. There are questions of fact and law common to the Wisconsin Classes that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. The questions of law and fact common to the Wisconsin Classes arising from Defendants' actions include, without limitation, the following: (1) Whether the work performed by Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Classes is compensable under federal law and/or Wisconsin law; (2) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class with forms of non-discretionary compensation, and whether Defendants failed to include these forms of non-discretionary compensation in the Wisconsin Class' regular rates of pay for overtime calculation purposes; (3) Whether Defendant Cameo Nursing Home failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class for daily on duty meal

periods that lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration; and (4) The nature and extent of class-wide injury and the measure of damages for the injury.

90. The questions set forth above predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons, and a class action is superior with respect to considerations of consistency, economy, efficiency, fairness and equity, to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the state law claims.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violations of the FLSA – Unpaid Overtime Wages
(Plaintiff on behalf of herself and the FLSA Collective – Non-Discretionary Compensation)

91. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the FLSA Collective, reassert and incorporate by reference all paragraphs set forth above as if restated herein.

92. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*

93. At all times material herein, Defendants were employers of Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective as provided under the FLSA.

94. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective were employees of Defendants as provided under the FLSA.

95. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are victims of uniform compensation policy and practice in violation of the FLSA.

96. Defendants violated the FLSA by suffering or permitting Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective to perform work without being properly or lawfully compensated for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours each workweek. Specifically, Defendants' unlawful compensation practice failed to include all forms of non-discretionary compensation, such as monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments, in the FLSA

Collective's regular rates of pay for overtime calculation purposes. By failing to compensate the FLSA Collective in such a fashion as described herein, this unlawful compensation practice denied Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective overtime premium pay for each hour they worked in excess of forty (40) hours each workweek and for which Defendants are liable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

97. The FLSA regulates, among other things, the payment of an overtime premium by employers whose employees are engaged in commerce, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

98. Defendants were and are subject to the overtime pay requirements of the FLSA because Defendants are enterprises engaged in commerce and/or its employees are engaged in commerce, as defined in FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(b).

99. Defendants' failure to properly compensate Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective and failure to properly record all compensable work time was willfully perpetrated. Defendants have not acted in good faith and with reasonable grounds to believe that their actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and as a result thereof, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid overtime premium pay described above pursuant to Section 216(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendants did not act willfully in failing to pay overtime premium pay wages, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to an award of pre-judgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

100. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to damages equal to the mandated overtime premium pay within the three (3) years preceding the date of filing of this Complaint,

plus periods of equitable tolling because Defendants acted willfully and knew or showed reckless disregard of whether its conduct was prohibited by the FLSA.

101. Pursuant to FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), successful plaintiffs are entitled to reimbursement of the costs and attorneys' fees expended in successfully prosecuting an action for unpaid wages and overtime wages.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violations of the FLSA – Unpaid Overtime Wages
(Plaintiff on behalf of herself and the FLSA Collective – Meal Periods)

102. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the FLSA Collective, reassert and incorporate by reference all paragraphs set forth above as if restated herein.

103. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*

104. At all times material herein, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home was an employer of Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective as provided under the FLSA.

105. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective were employees of Defendant Cameo Nursing Home as provided under the FLSA.

106. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are victims of Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's uniform compensation policy and practice in violation of the FLSA.

107. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home violated the FLSA by suffering or permitting Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective to perform work without being properly or lawfully compensated for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours each workweek. Specifically, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's unlawful compensation practice failed to compensate Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective for meal periods during which they were not completely relieved of duty or free from work for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration, in

violation of the WWPCCL, which resulted in overtime violations of the FLSA. By failing to compensate the FLSA Collective in such a fashion as described herein, this unlawful compensation practice denied Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective overtime premium pay for each hour they worked in excess of forty (40) hours each workweek and for which Defendant Cameo Nursing Home is liable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

108. The FLSA regulates, among other things, the payment of an overtime premium by employers whose employees are engaged in commerce, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

109. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home was and is subject to the overtime pay requirements of the FLSA because it is an enterprise engaged in commerce and/or its employees are engaged in commerce, as defined in FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(b).

110. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's failure to properly compensate Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective and failure to properly record all compensable work time was willfully perpetrated. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home has not acted in good faith and with reasonable grounds to believe that its actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and as a result thereof, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid overtime premium pay described above pursuant to Section 216(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant Cameo Nursing Home did not act willfully in failing to pay overtime premium pay wages, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to an award of pre-judgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

111. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to damages equal to the mandated overtime premium pay within the three (3) years preceding the date of filing of this Complaint, plus periods of equitable tolling because Defendant Cameo Nursing Home acted willfully and knew or showed reckless disregard of whether its conduct was prohibited by the FLSA.

112. Pursuant to FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), successful plaintiffs are entitled to reimbursement of the costs and attorneys' fees expended in successfully prosecuting an action for unpaid wages and overtime wages.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of the WWPCCL – Unpaid Overtime Wages
(Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Wisconsin Class – Non-Discretionary Compensation)

113. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Wisconsin Class, reassert and incorporate all previous paragraphs as if they were set forth herein.

114. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class were employees of Defendants within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01(1r), 103.001(5), and 104.01(2)(a).

115. At all relevant times, Defendants were employers of Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01(2), 103.001(6), and 104.01(3)(a), and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01(5).

116. At all relevant times, Defendants employed, and continue to employ, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01 *et seq.*, 103.01 *et seq.*, 104.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01.

117. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regularly performed activities that were an integral and indispensable part of their principal activities without receiving compensation for these activities.

118. At all relevant times, Defendants had common policies, programs, practices, procedures, protocols, routines, and rules of willfully failing to properly pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regular wages and overtime compensation.

119. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Defendant maintained and perpetrated an unlawful compensation practice that failed to include all forms of non-discretionary compensation, such as monetary bonuses, incentives, awards, and/or other rewards and payments, in Plaintiff's and the Wisconsin Class' regular rates of pay for overtime calculation purposes, in violation of the WWPCL.

120. Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours a workweek, in violation of the WWPCL.

121. As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class members have sustained losses in their compensation as a proximate result of Defendants' violations. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class seek damages in the amount of their respective unpaid compensation, injunctive relief requiring Defendants to cease and desist from its violations of the Wisconsin laws described herein and to comply with them, and such other legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper. Under Wis. Stat. § 109.11, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class may be entitled to liquidated damages equal and up to fifty percent (50%) of the unpaid wages.

122. Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class seek recovery of attorneys' fees and the costs of this action to be paid by Defendants pursuant to the WWPCL.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of the WWPCCL – Unpaid Overtime and Regular Wages
(Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Wisconsin Class – Unpaid Meal Periods)

123. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Wisconsin Class, reassert and incorporate all previous paragraphs as if they were set forth herein.

124. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class were employees of Defendant Cameo Nursing Home within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01(1r), 103.001(5), and 104.01(2)(a).

125. At all relevant times, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home was an employer of Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01(2), 103.001(6), and 104.01(3)(a), and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01(5).

126. At all relevant times, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home employed, and continues to employ, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01 *et seq.*, 103.01 *et seq.*, 104.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01.

127. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regularly performed activities that were an integral and indispensable part of their principal activities without receiving compensation for these activities.

128. At all relevant times, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home had common policies, programs, practices, procedures, protocols, routines, and rules of willfully failing to properly pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regular wages and overtime compensation.

129. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home maintained and perpetrated an unlawful compensation practice that failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class for meal periods during which they were not completely relieved of

duty or free from work for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration, in violation of the WWPCL.

130. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, the Wisconsin Class was entitled to payments from Defendant Cameo Nursing Home at their agreed upon wage, as defined in Wis. Stat. § 109.01(3), for each hour worked, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 109.03.

131. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Defendant Cameo Nursing Home did not compensate the Wisconsin Class for each and every hour worked, in accordance with Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.

132. Defendant Cameo Nursing Home willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class compensation at their regular rate of pay and/or at an overtime rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours a workweek as a result of failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class for meal periods during which they were not completely relieved of duty or free from work for at least thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration, in violation of the WWPCL.

133. As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class members have sustained losses in their compensation as a proximate result of Defendant Cameo Nursing Home's violations. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class seek damages in the amount of their respective unpaid compensation, injunctive relief requiring Defendant Cameo Nursing Home to cease and desist from its violations of the Wisconsin laws described herein and to comply with them, and such other legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper. Under Wis. Stat. § 109.11, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class may be entitled to liquidated damages equal and up to fifty percent (50%) of the unpaid wages.

134. Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class seek recovery of attorneys' fees and the costs of this action to be paid by Defendant Cameo Nursing Home pursuant to the WWPCCL.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that this Court grant the following relief:

- a) At the earliest possible time, issue an Order allowing Notice, or issue such Court supervised Notice, to all similarly-situated current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees who worked at and/or were employed by Defendants informing them of this action and their rights to participate in this action. Such Notice shall inform all similarly-situated current and qualified former employees of the pendency of this action, the nature of this action, and of their right to "opt in" to this action. Additionally, such notice will include a statement informing the similarly-situated current and qualified former employees that it is illegal for Defendants to take any actions in retaliation of their consent to join this action;
- b) At the earliest possible time, issue an Order certifying this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23;
- c) At the earliest possible time, issue an Order appointing Walcheske & Luzi, LLC as class counsel pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23;
- d) Issue an Order, pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, declaring Defendants' actions as described in the Complaint as unlawful and in violation of the FLSA and Wisconsin Law and applicable regulations and as willful as defined in the FLSA and Wisconsin Law;
- e) Issue an Order directing and requiring Defendants to pay Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt employees damages in the form of reimbursement for unpaid overtime wages and/or regular wages for all time spent performing compensable work for which they were not paid pursuant to the rate provided by the FLSA and WWPCCL;
- f) Issue an Order directing and requiring Defendants to pay Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt employees liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA and WWPCCL in an amount equal to, and in addition to the amount of wages and overtime wages owed to them;
- g) Issue an Order directing Defendants to reimburse Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for the costs and attorneys' fees expended in the course of litigating this action, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest; and
- h) Provide Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt employees with other relief that the Court deems just and equitable.

PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A JURY AS TO ALL TRIABLE ISSUES

Dated this 22nd day of September, 2021

WALCHESKE & LUZI, LLC
Counsel for Plaintiff

s/ **Scott S. Luzi**

James A. Walcheske, State Bar No. 1065635

Scott S. Luzi, State Bar No. 1067405

David M. Potteiger, State Bar No. 1067009

WALCHESKE & LUZI, LLC
235 N. Executive Drive, Suite 240
Brookfield, Wisconsin 53005
Telephone: (262) 780-1953
Fax: (262) 565-6469
E-Mail: jwalcheske@walcheskeluzi.com
E-Mail: sluzi@walcheskeluzi.com
E-Mail: dpotteiger@walcheskeluzi.com